

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	).	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/758,502		01/15/2004	David Benderly	BENDERLY	6160
156	7590	06/02/2006		EXAMINER	
	•	TTINGER, ISRAE	HEINRICH,	HEINRICH, SAMUEL M	
& SCHIFF 489 FIFTH			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
NEW YOR	RK, NY	10017	1725		
				DATE MAILED: 06/02/2000	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			1
		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		10/758,502	BENDERLY, DAVID
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Samuel M. Heinrich	1725
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence address
WHIC - Externafter - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE MAIL	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 M	larch 2006.	
2a)⊠	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This	action is non-final.	
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowar	•	
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.
Dispositi	ion of Claims		
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 38-43 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 38-43 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.	
Applicati	ion Papers		
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on <u>15 January 2004</u> is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	accepted or b) $\square$ objected or b) $\square$ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Setion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119		
a)l	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  Certified copies of the priority documents  Certified copies of the priority documents  Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔲 Inforr	et(s)  De of References Cited (PTO-892)  De of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  The mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  The No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5)  Notice of Informal F 6)  Other:	

Application/Control Number: 10/758,502

Art Unit: 1725

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Oath/Declaration

This application claims a priority date of July 20, 2009 which is incorrect.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 38-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a stencil filled with fusible coating material, does not reasonably provide enablement for the use of a "fusible material having a melting point greater than that of the gemstones". The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to perform the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Hackh's Chemical Dictionary describes diamond as being unfusible, thereby having no melting point.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,129,965 to Langan in view of USPN 6,329,631 to Yueh and in view of EP0897021A1. Langan describes (column 1, lines 36-47) well known label

**Art Unit: 1725** 

manufacture and label shipping and subsequent label use at a site separate from the manufacture site. Langan does not describe applying stencils and subsequent marking objects. Yueh describe a well known stencil filled with fusible material such as metal. The use of a stencil such as disclosed by Yueh with a manufacture and shipping technique such as described by Langan would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art because the stencil can be produced at one site and used at a different site intended for a different production. EP0897021A1 describes (Basic-Abstract) the marking of gemstones with deposited material. The use of deposited material in a stencil at a manufacturing site would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art because the stencil provides reproducible markings.

Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,129,965 to Langan in view of USPN 6,329,631 to Yueh and in view of EP0897021A1 as applied to claim 38 above, and further in view of USPN 3,464,617 to Raynes et al. Raynes et al describe well known adhesive application of a perform carrier to a work piece. The use of such adhesive application would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art because the location of the coating material can be easily controlled.

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,129,965 to Langan in view of USPN 6,329,631 to Yueh and in view of EP0897021A1 as applied to claim 38 above, and further in view of USPN 4,179,322 to Brown et al. Brown et al describes the use of a cover layer and the use thereof with a carrier a

marking material would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art because the cover protects the work piece prior to the use thereof.

Claims 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,129,965 to Langan in view of USPN 6,329,631 to Yueh and in view of EP0897021A1 as applied to claim 38 above, and further in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). AAPA describes (Specification, Description of the Related Art) related art which discloses well known application of marking material to diamonds including custom inscriptions and graphics. The use of a diamond workpiece with a marking process would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art because marking of diamonds for identification has been done at least for decades.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to new claims 38-43 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### **Conclusion**

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samuel M. Heinrich whose telephone number is 571-272-1175. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

Application/Control Number: 10/758,502 Page 5

Art Unit: 1725

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, P. Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Samuel M Heinrich Primary Examiner Art Unit 1725

M. Hernich